



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,599	02/09/2007	Yasuhiro Fujita	AOI-P4I	8619
26793	7590	05/21/2010		
LEIGHTON K. CHONG PATENT ATTORNEY 133 KAAI STREET HONOLULU, HI 96821				
EXAMINER				
ANDRISH, SEAN D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3672				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/21/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/567,599	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FUJITA, YASUHIRO	
	<b>Examiner</b> SEAN D. ANDRISH	<b>Art Unit</b> 3672	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) SEAN D. ANDRISH.

(2) Leighton Chong.

**Date of Interview:** 5/11/10; 5/12/10

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
NA

Claims discussed:  
NA

Prior art documents discussed:  
NA

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J. Bagnell/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3672

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A notice of allowance has been mailed and the issue fee has been paid for the present application. On 11 May 2010, Examiner contacted applicant to inform him that editorial changes to the specification are required before the patent can be published. Specifically, the Summary of the Invention section of the specification contains numerous references to specific claims, and each of the references to the claims should be removed prior to publication of the patent. For example, the phrase "as claimed in claim 1", as recited on lines 3 - 4 of page 3, should be deleted from the specification. The Summary of the Invention is replete with similar errors. Examiner requested that applicant file a 312 amendment to make the necessary changes to the specification. Examiner noted that the MPEP 714(I)(B) allows applicant to replace an entire section of the specification and, just as with replacement paragraphs, replacement sections must contain the appropriate markings to indicate subject matter that has been deleted from the specification. Applicant agreed to prepare the 312 amendment and file it electronically.

In a follow-up telephone call on 12 May, 2010, examiner informed applicant that applicant did not have to file a 312 amendment to amend the specification as discussed on 11 May 2010 because the examiner will generate a supplemental examiner's amendment to make the agreed upon changes to the specification.